

KIPP INDIANAPOLIS

2009-2010 Performance Analysis

Core Question 2: Is the organization effective and well-run?

2.1. Is the school in sound fiscal health?	
STANDARD	The school presents significant concerns in no more than <u>one</u> of the following areas: a) its state financial audits (e.g., presence of “significant findings”); b) its financial staffing and systems; c) its success in achieving a balanced budget over the past three years; d) the adequacy of its projections of revenues and expenses for the next three years; e) its fulfillment of financial reporting requirements under Sections 10 and 17 of the charter agreement. In addition, if the school presents significant concerns in one area, it has a credible plan for addressing the concern that has been approved by the Mayor’s Office.

2009-10 Performance: Does Not Meet Standard

In 2009-10, KIPP Indianapolis demonstrated unsatisfactory financial performance and had not established adequate staffing and systems for managing the school’s finances. The school had not fulfilled its financial reporting requirements and did not regularly meet its reporting deadlines in a timely and accurate manner.

The Mayor’s Office contracts with an independent accounting firm to complete annual financial performance reviews of each school. Based on a review of KIPP’s finances for 2009-10, the Mayor’s Office found that KIPP Indianapolis did not achieve a balanced budget. Expenses for the fiscal year exceeded revenues by \$60,134 in 2009-2010. Additionally, multiple times throughout 2009-2010, the school had to rely on debt forgiveness when faced with an inability to pay contractors or vendors for services provided.

Financial reporting requirements to both the Mayor’s Office and other oversight bodies were frequently been submitted late in 2009-10. Additionally, as of early 2010, KIPP Indianapolis had yet to implement Title I programs as outlined in their agreement with the state. The school had also failed to fulfill parental notification procedures as outlined by the program. Thus, the school does not meet standard for this indicator based on their 2009-10 performance.

2.2. Are the school’s student enrollment, attendance, and retention rates strong?	
STANDARD	The school is consistently fully enrolled. Student attendance and retention rates are generally at or above the school’s agreed-upon target rates.

2009-10 Performance: Does Not Meet Standard

KIPP Indianapolis did not meet enrollment targets set for 2009-10. The following chart displays the school's target enrollment compared with its official fall enrollment, as reported by the IDOE.

Year	Target Enrollment	Fall Enrollment	Percent Below
2009-10	320	207	35.3%

Source: Official fall enrollment figures from the IDOE. Target enrollment is the maximum capacity from the school's charter agreement with the Mayor's Office, submitted by the school.

The 2009-10 attendance rate at KIPP was below the averages of both the county and the state.

	KIPP	MC	IN
2009-10 Attendance rate	93.30%	95.70%	95.90%

No targets have been established for student retention rates for KIPP Indianapolis. The school retained only 42% of the students enrolled in the Fall of 2008, excluding those who aged out of the school.

Years	Students Enrolled Initial Year	Students Re-enrolled Following Year	Retention Rate
Fall 2008 to Fall 2009	207	87	42.0%

Source: Mayor's Office analysis of Student Residence report submitted to the IDOE and the Mayor's Office by the school. Students in the 8th Grade class excluded from analysis. Enrollment numbers differ from official IDOE enrollment figures due to this exclusion.

Based on the 2009-10 performance, KIPP does not meet the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator because they were not fully enrolled and had an attendance rate below that of both the state and county.

2.3. Is the school's Board active and competent in its oversight?	
STANDARD	The Board's membership collectively contributes a broad skill set and fair representation of the community; Board members are knowledgeable about the school; roles and responsibilities of the Board are clearly delineated; Board meetings reflect thoughtful discussion and progress in the consideration of issues; overall, the Board provides consistent and competent stewardship of the school.

2009-10 Performance: **Approaching Standard**

In 2009-10, the board of directors at KIPP Indianapolis experienced significant turnover unrelated to term limits and struggled to ensure that all Open Door Laws were consistently followed.

Because of the significant turnover of the school's staff and board in years four and five, the Mayor's Office contracted with experts to conduct a sixth year site visit to more thoroughly understand the school's performance. The sixth year review team found that between years five and six, the board had been reconstituted with four new members and a newly appointed board chair. At the time of the review, only one member out of nine had served on the board for longer than 15 months. The review commended the board on its increased diversity, in regards to gender and ethnicity as well as areas of professional expertise. However, the review found that meeting minutes did not clearly specify which members voted during meetings. Because of this, it was difficult for the team to ascertain whether ex-officio, non-voting members of the board voted on official board business. Since the time of the visit, the board corrected this issue.

The Mayor's Office regularly attends board meetings and has noted the increased levels of engagement and commitment from the members. The board became increasingly more active in school operations and communication with staff and parents during 2009-10. The board developed a subcommittee structure that allowed members to oversee each critical area of operation. Based on the performance demonstrated in the 2009-10 academic year, the KIPP Indianapolis board is approaching the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator.

2.4. Is there a high level of parent satisfaction with the school?	
STANDARD	More than 80% but less than 90% of parents surveyed indicate that they are satisfied overall with the school.

2009-10 Performance: Does Not Meet Standard

In the spring of each year, researchers administer anonymous surveys to parents of students enrolled at Mayor-sponsored charter schools. In 2009-10, 52% of KIPP parents reported overall satisfaction with the school. According to the data, the school does not meet the Mayor's Office standard for performance for this indicator for the 2009-10 academic year.

It should be noted that the school collected a total of only 21 parent surveys in 2009-2010, despite having total student enrollment of over 200. Therefore, it is unclear if results for 2009-10 are representative of the parent population at the school.

2.5. Is the school administration strong in its academic and organizational leadership?	
STANDARD	The school's leadership a) has sufficient academic and/or business expertise; b) has been sufficiently stable over time; c) has clearly defined roles and responsibilities among leaders and between leaders and the Board; d) actively engages in a process of continuous improvement which has led to some mid-course corrections.

2009-10 Performance: Approaching Standard

KIPP Indianapolis experienced turnover between 2008-09 and 2009-10, with a new school leader and assistant school leader joining the staff prior to the beginning of the 2009-10. The new

school leader and assistant school leader were hired after an extensive nationwide search conducted by the board with some technical assistance provided by the KIPP Foundation.

As a result of the significant changes leading up to 2009-10, the Mayor's Office contracted with experts to conduct a site visit in the Spring 2010. The site team found that the high levels of turnover in administrators, teachers and students had had an adverse impact on the school. Additionally, the reviewers found the new school leader to be unresponsive to requests for information and with communication in general. The review team commended the school leader, assistant school leader, and board for developing a new organizational structure to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each entity. Additionally, the board and administration had worked together to create a strategic plan to address some of the school's fundamental issues. In general, the site team found that the school had been unable to stabilize school leadership and cited the critical need for the board to identify staff willing to make a long term commitment to the school. Therefore, for 2009-10, leadership at the school was approaching the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator.

2.6. Is the school meeting its school-specific organizational and management performance goals?	
Meets standard	School has clearly met its school-specific organizational goal.

Not applicable. KIPP Indianapolis did not have school-specific organizational and management performance goals that were evaluated in 2009-10.